

S.T.

A
POSTSCRIPT,
Containing the
AUTHORS VINDICATION
O F
Himself and Doctrine
FROM THE
IMPUTATIONS
O F
Dr. JOHN OWEN,

In his late BOOK styled
*The Doctrine of Justification by
Faith through the Imputation of
the Righteousness of Christ.*

Si satis est accusasse, Quis erit innocens?

By THOMAS HOTCHKIS Rect. of Stanton by
Highworth in the County of Wilts.

LONDON,

Printed by S.R. for Walter Kettilby, at the Bishops
Head in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1678.

An Advertisement to the Reader.

THis Apology was designed by the Reverend Author to be annexed to the Second part of his Discourse now in the Press, and for that reason he Entituled it a *Postscript*; but because that will not come forth so soon as was hoped, I have with his leave, published it by its self.

Walter Kettilby.

Errata in the Postscript Apologetical.

PAge 3. line 28. read incompatible. p. 16. l. 2. add *viz.* before Com. p. 20. l. 3. r. wholly. p. 31. l. 16. after *of* add *the*. p. 35. l. 16. r. Distinctions.



A

Postscript Apologetical,

CONTAINING

The Authors Vindication of
himself and Doctrines from the
Imputations of Doctor *John*
Owen in his late Book styled
The Doctrine of Justification by Faith
through the Imputation of the Right-
eousness of Christ.

Si satis est accusasse, Quis erit innocens?



Although to be judged (or misjudged)
by mans judgment was with the A-
postle St. Paul *εἰς ἐλάχισον*, a very
small thing, 1 Cor. 4. 3. he did ne-
vertheless vigorously assert his own
innocency, and industriously vindicate himself
against the misprisions, and prejudices of those, who

B

did

did seek to blemish the reputation of his Person and Ministry, saying, *We have wronged no man, we have corrupted no man, we have defrauded no man,* 2 Cor. 7. 2. As I take it for my Duty to imitate that blessed Apostle in the former; so I hope, that it will not be deemed a thing superfluous (either fault, or folly) for such a one as my self to follow his example in the latter, and in compliance therewith to stand up in my just defence against the injurious imputations of Doctor *John Owen*, touching my dealing with him in my Discourse concerning *The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us, and our Sins to him.* I will transcribe in his own words all that he chargeth me with, and then make reply to every distinct passage.

The first place, wherein I find my Name mentioned in his Book, is p. 50. where having told his Readers, *That whereas some men of an inferiour condition have found it useful for the strengthening themselves in their dependencies, or in compliance with their own inclinations, to cavil at his Writings in his Discourse stiled (Communion with God) and to revile their Author, he doth immediately after the said description of me (A person of an inferiour condition) proceed to give notice of me by my proper Name, saying.*

This Course is steered of late by one Mr. Hotchkis in a Book about Justification, wherein in particular he falls very severely on that Doctrine, which for the substance of it, is here again proposed, p. 81. And were it not that I hope, it may be somewhat useful to him to be a little warned of his Immoralities in that Discourse, I should not in the least have taken notice of his other Impertinencies. The Good man I perceive can be angry with persons, whom
be

he never saw, and about things which he cannot, or will not understand, so far as to revile them with most opprobrious Language. For my part, although I have never written any thing designedly on this Subject, or this Doctrine of Justification before now; yet he could not but discern by what was occasionally delivered, that I maintain no other Doctrine herein, but what is the most common faith of the most learned men in all Protestant Churches: And the reasons, why I am singled out for the object of his petulancy, and spleen, are too manifest to need repetition. But I shall yet inform him, of what perhaps he is ignorant, Namely, That I esteem it no small Honour, that the Reproaches, wherewith the Doctrine opposed by him is reproached, does fall upon me. And the same I say concerning all the reviling and contemptuous expressions, that his ensuing pages are filled withall.

Ans. 1. What? Hath the Doctor, having charged me with so many Immoralities, well spoken as he thought? or did he think me indeed to be a good man, when he has so called me? Are all, or any of these Immoralities (spleen, petulancy, reproaching, reviling, contemptuous and opprobrious Language, wherewith my Book is here said, not only to be here and there tainted, but filled) any signs or tokens of goodness? Are they not rather incomperible with it? But those words of his were intended for a Flout, and I had much rather have been without the Doctors sweet Bit (the Good man) than to have it given me with such shrewd Knocks, I mean, with the Imputation of so many heinous Crimes, as does speak nothing less than goodness in any man. But it being a Sarcasm, or Scoff, let it pass as a cast of his courtesie; not that I requite

him for it in Kind, I mean with the like mock or scoff, after the proofs of his belying and slandering me, by replying in his own Language, The Good man Doctor *Owen*.

2. As for the said manifold Immoralities, whereof I am here accused, I need say no more in this place by way of defence, than *St. Paul* being impleaded, did for himself in another case (that is) by a flat denial of them all; for, as he says, *Neither against the Law of the Jews, neither against the Temple, nor yet against Caesar have I offended any thing at all, Acts 25. 8.* in like sort shall I say for my self, that by a serious review of all that I have written in my Discourse (here challenged by the Doctor) I am not conscious to my self, that I have offended any thing at all, neither by spleen, nor by petulancy or malepertness, nor by cavilling, nor by reviling, nor by any opprobrious Language; Having only shewed the manifold and dangerous evil consequences of his Doctrine, as is the manner of all the most temperate Authors, who have written against the Imputation of Christs Righteousness in the sense professedly opposed in my Discourse: So that he is disappointed of that Honour, which in an holy ambition he hath carved to himself, I mean, the honour of suffering reproach for the Name and Doctrine of Christ; to the bearing whereof he would not have me ignorant of his resolution and readiness.

3. As for my want of Wit or Will to understand the things I write about, here objected to me, I shall altogether leave to the Reader to judge of me as he sees cause, as well with respect to my Intellectuals as Morals, the Doctor, it seems, hoping that it may be useful for himself and his

Cause

Cause in hand, to accuse me respectively to both.

4. I have hitherto discerned the contrary to what he here says, I could not but discern, *viz.* That the Doctrine concerning the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in his sense (*i.e.*) in its formal and essential nature, hath been opposed as the singular faith of some, but not received as the common faith, by many of the most learned men both in our own, and in foreign Protestant Churches.

5. The doctor having so highly charged me in the general, proceeds to instance in some of my immoralities, and begins to do it in the words following, p. 51. *But as to the present occasion, I beg his excuse, If I believe him not, that the reading of the passages, which he mentions out of my Book, filled him with Horror and Indignation, as he pretends.*

Ans. The Doctor was a very unhappy man for he doth *in ipso limine titubare*, stumble at the very threshold, I mean begins his Charge against me with a notorious untruth: For I did not pretend any Horror at all, much less a being filled with Horror; and therefore as I wonder, how he could believe himself in this suggestion, so I must say, There was no cause, why he should beg my excuse in not believing a pretence of his own feigning; but instead of begging my excuse there is reason, that he should beg pardon for this his falshood, as I am now to make apparent by the transcription of my own words out of the 83^d. page of my Discourse, wherein I expressly said.

I have with a complication of affections (grief and sadness, with a mixture also of some indignation and abhorrency) taken notice of three, or four things in his express words.

Judge whether the Doctor by imputing to me the said pretence of Horrour (which is printed with a great Letter, and in a different Character, that it might the rather be observed) yea of my being filled with Horrour by reading the passages mentioned out of his Book, hath belyed me, or no; for among that variety of affections, wherewith I said, I did take notice of his said words, I make no mention at all of any horrour, grief and sadness being intimated in the said complication of affections to be the most predominant, with a mixture only of indignation and abhorrency in some lower degree.

But to prove the said fit of Horrour (feigned indeed by him, but not in the least by me pretended) he assigns the following reason immediately in saying,

For whereas he acknowledgeth, that my words may have a sense which he approves of (and which therefore must of necessity be good and sound;) what honest and sober person would not rather take them in that sense, than wrest them unto another, to cast himself under the disquietment of a fit of horrible indignation.

To pass by his flout in the Parenthesis (And which therefore must of necessity be good and sound)

1. You see how he repeats his slanderous imputation of a fit of horrible indignation as pretended by me, the fallhood whereof hath already been laid open.

2. We do acknowledge it to be a special part of Christian sobriety and honesty to take another mans words in the most approved sense, which they will well bear. But if the person, whose words they are, will not own, or be satisfied with
such

such a construction of his words; asserting withall such a sense of them, as is not to be approved of; What should the most honest and sober person do in such a case? And this is the very case here betwixt me and my Accuser: for the Doctor will not own, or content himself with the truth of that construction, which may be made of his words, as I have expressly said and made apparent in the 18th Chapter of my Discourse, p. 85, 87. to which I shall (for the acquitting of my self from the dishonesty here charged upon me) refer both my Accuser himself and every Reader for his full satisfaction.

4. Consequently I may truly say by way of re-tortion upon my Adversary, That there was neither honesty nor sobriety in this his imputing to me such an odious crime, as the wresting of his words from a good sense by him intended, to a bad sense disallowed by him.

My Delator proceeds a third and fourth time to cast me in the Teeth with the said fit of Horror saying, p. 51.

In this fit I suppose it was, if such a fit indeed did befall him (as one evil begets another) that he thought, he might insinuate something of my denial of the necessity of our own personal repentance and obedience: For no man, who had read that Book only of all my writings, could with the least regard to Conscience or Honesty, give countenance to such a surmise, unless his mind was much discomposed by the unexpected invasion of a fit of Horror.

Ans^r. It was never in my thoughts (in any fit, or at any time) to insinuate, that the Doctor doth in all manner of respects, or in respect of all sorts of persons (Believers and Unbelievers) or as to all intents and purposes, deny the necessity

of personal repentance, and obedience : For having read that Book of his I do plainly perceive, that he doth acknowledge the necessity of obedience and good works in many distinct respects (respectively both to God and man, our selves and others;) But I could never perceive by the reading of that his Book, that he doth acknowledge the necessity thereof in one main respect, which according to the current of Scripture ought to be asserted, the necessity thereof I mean in order to Gods pardoning our sins, and receiving us into his gracious acceptance for the obedience sake of Christ; Yea, I perceive the contrary, as by a multitude of passages in his late Book concerning Justification by Faith, so by his asserting, *That we are justified by Faith in opposition to all Works of ours, no place being left for any works to make the least approach towards our justification before God under the covert of any distinction whatsoever,* p. 457, 458. *That no man is to do any good work with respect to his justification, and that God considereth no mans works, no mans duties of obedience in his Justification,* p. 455. *And forasmuch as its said, That God justifieth him, who worketh not, I cannot understand* (says he, p. 456.) *what place our works, or duties of obedience can have in our justification; saying further, Why should we trouble our selves to invent, of what consideration they may be in our justification before God, when the Apostle himself affirms, that they are of none at all:* with more to this purpose in the same page, and many others; he saying, p. 515. *Not this or that sort of works, not this or that manner of performance of them, not this or that kind of interest in our justification; but all works, of what sort soever, and however performed, are excluded from any kind of consideration, as our works and duties of obedience,*

Now

Now the foresaid, with many other the like assertions in his Book, are to my seeming a denial of the necessity of repentance and obedience towards, or in order to a Sinners Pardon and Salvation; for by place, or interest in justification (as are his expressions here) he meaneth (as his expressions are elsewhere, *p. 514.*) the place of a condition, or a thing requisite in order to our justification, or that we may be justified before God. Now what is that justification before God, which is promised to sinners for the righteousness sake of Christ? or what is it for a sinner to be so justified, but not to be condemned? And what is it not to be condemned, but on the contrary side to be absolved, pardoned, saved; Salvation from the guilt of sin being the self-same thing with Gospel-justification? Yea, the Doctor himself doth acknowledge pardon of sin to be one essential part of, yea, the first and the principal part of justification (*p. 403.*) and he doth frequently use the words (justified and pardoned) as expressions synonymous, expounding the former by the latter; and speaking concerning the Publicans going to his house justified, *p. 178.* he expounds the word [justified] saying, that is, acquitted, absolved, pardoned; so that denying any place to be left for any good works to make the least approach towards our justification before God, he doth consequently and necessarily deny the necessity of repentance, and any other good work towards the pardon of sin. Yea he doth professedly deny it; For his professed Doctrine is, that a sinner is justified (that is pardoned) antecedently in order of nature unto all evangelical works (*p. 525.*) on which account he asserts (*p. 217.*) that our personal righteousness cannot be the condition of our justification

justification before God, because it is consequential thereunto. And thence it is, that although he acknowledgeth a necessity of repentance in, or to a person already justified (that is, a person already pardoned) yet he denies the necessity thereof towards, or in order to his justification (*i.e.*) his absolution or remission. And as he doth expressly deny true or evangelical repentance to be any condition of our justification, so he doth express positively to what end Repentance is, and is not required of sinners in the Gospel, saying, p. 301.

Repentance for sin is peculiarly proposed with respect unto the Forgiveness of sins, as that without which it is impossible we should have any True sense, or comfort of it in our Souls; but it is not so as any part of that Righteousness, on the consideration whereof our sins are pardoned, nor as that whereby we have an interest therein.

Hereupon let the Reader judge, whether any man, who hath been conversant in the Doctors Writings, may not with due regard to his own Conscience and honesty, and without any discomposure by any fit of Horrour (so causelessly and frequently imputed to me give countenance to a surmise, That he doth deny the necessity of our own personal repentance and obedience (*i.e.*) in order to the remission of our sins; which although he doth professedly deny, as hath been manifested by his own words before recited (thereby subverting the Doctrine of the Gospel, turning it upside down; forasmuch as in the Gospel sinners are advised and commanded to repent, that they may be pardoned, *Mat.* 3. 19. and 8. 22.) Nevertheless I must acknowledge, that elsewhere he seems to me to say, or at least to imply the contrary,

trary; so that I am not able to reconcile him to himself, he saying concerning the *Publican* (p. 171.) *The Publican went down, justified unto his House; that is, acquitted, absolved, pardoned, upon the confession of his sins, and supplication for remission.* These words do pregnantly imply, that the Publican was not justified antecedently to his repentance, or penitential confession of his sin, and supplication for pardoning mercy. And in his Vindication against Mr. Sherlock, the Doctor hath these words, p. 53. *I never said, I never wrote, that the only supposition of the satisfaction of Christ is sufficient of it self to free us from destruction by sin. There is moreover required on our part Faith and Repentance, without which we can have no Advantage by it, or Interest in it.* These words are a contradiction even in terms to his words before recited out of his late Book, p. 301. He there saying, *That Repentance is not any part of that Righteousness, on the consideration whereof our sins are pardoned, nor that, whereby we have interest therein.* But whether this forecited contradiction can, or cannot be reconciled, I hope notwithstanding, that I have fully acquitted my self from the Doctors foresaid imputation of want of Conscience and honesty in countenancing the surmise of his denying (as to the foresaid intent and purpose, i.e. the pardon of our sins) the necessity of repentance.

And as he denies the necessity of repentance and obedience to be any part of the condition of obtaining, or in order to the attaining the remission of our sins (faith alone being in his divinity the condition thereof) so he doth professedly deny the necessity of repentance and works of obedience to be the condition of, or in order to the retaining of our pardon: for denying good works to be

be any part of the condition of our justification; or that they are necessary in order to the not losing it, he doth consequently and unavoidably deny them to be the condition of the continuance of our pardon, or not losing it (this being in some Cases, and upon certain suppositions threatned, *Mat. 6. 14. and 18. 32. 1 Chron. 28. 9. & 2. 15. 2. Heb. 10. 38.*) forasmuch as pardon of sin is by his own confession (as was aforesaid) the first and principal part of Gospel-justification. He indeed confesseth (p. 208.) that our obedience and good works are the condition of the continuation of our justification, namely, that God doth indispensably require good works and obedience in all that are justified, so that a justified estate is inconsistent with the neglect of them; Nevertheless he doth deny, that the continuance of our justification doth depend upon any works of our obedience, but only upon Faith; *For my part (says he, p. 204.) I cannot understand, that the continuation of our justification hath any other dependencies, than hath our justification it self: (by our justification it self he must and would be understood to mean our justification at first.) As Faith alone is required unto the one, so Faith alone is required unto the other. And p. 209. he says, That Faith is the only way, means and cause on our part of the continuance of our justification--- (Though Faith be the way, means, or condition; yet for my part I dare not say, that it is the cause of our justification, whether begun, or continued, first, or last.) And in the same page he argues against our obedience its being the condition of the continuation of our justification, and says,*

If the continuation of our justification dependeth upon our own works of obedience, then is the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto us only with respect

respect
wor
guing
cont
ly of
and g
altho
confi
(tha
that
confi
me e
ly ap
that
obed
whic
our
infer
sins.
nials
part
and
pend
who
ness
that
bedic
as in
God
of m
ceeds
B
nor d
except
escap
self,

respect unto our justification at first—— It is not my
 work in this place to answer, or to refute his ar-
 guings, but only to manifest, that he denies the
 continuation of our justification (and consequent-
 ly of our pardon) to depend upon our obedience
 and good works as the necessary condition thereof;
 although for my part, how he could deny it in
 consistency with himself, and with his yielding
 (that God doth indispensably require them in all
 that are justified, so that a justified estate is in-
 consistent with the neglect of them) is not with
 me easie to understand: However, it is sufficient-
 ly apparent, that he would be understood to deny,
 that God hath constituted any good works of our
 obedience to be any part of the condition, upon
 which God hath promised the continuation of
 our justification and (as inevitably must thence be
 inferred) of our retaining the remission of our
 sins. And yet notwithstanding his professed de-
 nials of repentance and obedience to be any
 part of the condition, upon which our attaining,
 and retaining the pardon of our sins doth de-
 pend; he hath the confidence to charge any man,
 who hath read his Books with unconscionable-
 ness and dishonesty, who shall offer to insinuate,
 that he denies the necessity of repentance and o-
 bedience in order to any such ends and purposes,
 as in scripture they are declared to be ordained of
 God. And as if hitherunto he had not said enough
 of my want of Conscience and Honesty, he pro-
 ceeds to cast more filth upon me, saying,

And he
 says ex-
 pressly
 P. 170.
 Every pro-
 mise of
 God doth
 tacitly re-
 quire Faith
 and Obe-
 dience in
 us.

*But such is his dealing with me from first to last,
 nor do I know where to fix on any one instance of his
 exceptions against me, wherein I can suppose, he had
 escaped his pretended fit, and was returned to him-
 self, that is, unto honest and ingenuous thoughts,
 wherewith*

wherewith, I hope, he is mostly conversant. But though I cannot miss in the justification of this charge by considering any instance of his reflections, yet I shall at present take that, which he insists longest upon, and filleth his Discourse about it with most scurrility of expressions: And this is in the 164th page and those that follow.

Ans. 1. The Doctor having wilfully, or over hastily cast himself into a fit of slandering, knows not well on a sudden how to come out of it: for this is the fifth time that he hath repeated the slanderous imputation of the said fit of Horrour, and horrible indignation, as pretended by me, with the addition of another slander touching my dealing with him from first to last without honesty and ingenuity; of all which Accusations he hath given in no true evidence, whereby to convict me.

2. As to the scurrility of expressions here charged upon me (which indeed is another slander added to the former) I appeal to the judgment of any impartial Reader, who will be at the pains to read that Chapter in my Discourse, whether the Doctor hath not as to this imputation also condemned the guiltless. And if he fail in the justification of the charge here commenced against me; it may with reason be conjectured, that he will miss the Mark he aims at in all the rest. And now enters the great instance pickt out by him of my disingenuity and dishonesty, together with the proof thereof, it being expressed by him in the following words, p. 53. line 9. to line 31.

For there he disputeth fiercely against me for making this to be an undue end of our serving God; namely, that we fly from the wrath to come. And who would not take this for an unexpiable crime in any; especially in him, who hath written so much

of the
spel,
them
fore
his r
lowed
preva
Minij
himse
vice
Lives
a Sp
it by
of th
tion;
to con
Righ
What
be ad
pudor
An
laid t
---B
word
like th
becom
of the
me w
and r
justify
the i
Disco
be tra
judge
2.
my D
of

of the nature and use of Threatnings under the Gospel, and the Fear, that ought to be ingenerated by them in the hearts of men, as I have done? Wherefore so great a Crime being the object of them; all his revilings seem not only to be excused, but hallowed. But what if all this should prove a wilful prevarication, not becoming a good man, much less a Minister of the Gospel? My words transcribed by himself are these, [some there are, who do the service of the House of God as the drudgery of their Lives; the Principle they yield obedience upon, is a Spirit of Bondage unto fear; the Rule they do it by, is the Law in its dread and rigour, exacting it of them to the utmost without mercy and mitigation; the end they do it for, is to fly from the wrath to come, to pacifie Conscience, and to seek for Righteousness as it were by the works of the Law.] What follows to the same purpose he omits; and what he adds as my words, are not so, but his own: ubi pudor? ubi fides?

Ans. 1. Here are many and grievous Crimes laid to my charge, scurrility, reviling, fierceness --- But (to retort upon my Accuser in his own words) what if these prove, or be proved to be like the rest, presumptuous, or wilful slanders, unbecoming a good man, and much more a Minister of the Gospel? As to the falshood of his charging me with scurrility, fierce manner of disputing and reviling, for the detecting thereof, and for the justifying of my self, I can but refer the Reader to the impartial perusal of the 29th Chapter in my Discourse (here reflected upon, but too large to be transcribed at length here) leaving him to judge of me as he shall find cause.

2. The Doctors words as transcribed by me in my Discourse, are not as here they are Printed,
(some

(some there are) but [There be *Gibeonites*] these being the Doctors own words in his Book (*Communion with God.*) Now the reason why he did thus fallaciously report his own words, will be specified by and by in its due place.

3. Forasmuch as the Doctor doth not acquaint the Reader what are the words, with the addition whereof he chargeth me, exclaiming thereupon, *Ubi pudor? Ubi fides?* I cannot therefore acquit my self in point of Modesty and Honesty (the shameful vices contrary to those lovely virtues being laid to my charge) but by giving the Reader a Transcript thereof out of my Discourse, p. 164. line 4, 5, 6. *The Saints obedience is a free obedience; without fear, terrour, bondage and constraint they go forth unto all holy obedience in Christ.*

2 Sam. 13. 13. Now I do freely acknowledge, that the crime, wherewith I am here charged, is an heinous crime; yea, it is an iniquity to be punished by the Judge; and had I incurr'd the guilt of any such crime, I would say with that unspeckled Hand-maiden [And I, whither shall I cause my shame to go?] But the Doctor shall not so ravish me of my reputation, which I shall fully clear and vindicate by the transcription of his own words, as I find them in the 145 page of his Book (*Communion with God*) and in the self same page, where those very words of his are, to which an addition is said to be made by me) where the Doctor having said, That the Saints obedience is a free obedience, his words, line 19. 20, and 21.) are these.

The Children of God do freely, willingly, genuinely, without fear, terrour, bondage and constraint go forth unto all holy obedience in Christ.

Ecce

Ecce fides, Lo the faithfulness and integrity, that doth well become a good man, and a good Minister of Christ. See Reader, how I have acquitted my self from that abominable forgery here imputed to me; the Case standing as it doth, there is just ground of retorting upon him in his own words, *Ubi pudor? Ubi fides?*

3. As for the Doctors words here said to be omitted by me, I my self did signifie the omission thereof in my Discourse by the stroke of my Pen--- And so far as he here says, that the words omitted by me were to the same purpose as those transcribed; I do therefore conclude, that his intent was to impeach me only for the forementioned addition to his words, and not at all for any omission.

4. What he here saith, he hath written concerning the nature and use of threatnings under the Gospel, I do not at all remember; Only I do now observe, that he doth here make mention of the Fear, that ought to be ingenerated by them in the hearts of men: But I do not as yet perceive, that by men he would be understood to mean men of all sorts, *i. e.* Good men and Bad men, Believers and Unbelievers. I do question his intended sense therein for these two reasons: 1. Because it is the common Doctrine of too many Teachers in these later times, That Believers are to live above and without all manner of fear of Divine wrath and vengeance in any case, or upon any supposition threatned to them in the Gospel of Christ; for the rectifying of which mistake I wrote 22 years ago a large Chapter in my exercitation concerning the nature of forgiveness of sin (*Chap. 26.*) the scope thereof being to prove, That & how, or in what case, and upon what Scriptural supposals Believers are

to fear Hell and Damnation, viz. Upon supposition, or in case of their revolt and drawing back, *Heb.* 10. 38. and 12. last.

2. This fear of Divine threatnings the Doctor directly and professedly sets himself to extinguish in Believers, his Doctrine being this (as was noted in the former part of my Discourse, p. 168.) *That it is the Law of God, as divested of all its terrifying, threatening, damning, cursing power, which is the rule of the Saints obedience.*

The next Crime objected against me, and from which I am to purge my self, is my insinuating, that he makes this an undue end of our serving God; namely, That we may fly from the wrath to come. I shall recite the matter, as hitherto all along I have done, in his own words, and then subjoin my reply thereunto.

That which I affirmed (says the Doctor, p. 52, 53.) to be a part of an evil end, when, and as it makes up one entire end by being mixed with sundry other things expressly mention'd, is singled out, as if I had denied, that in any sense it might be a part of a good end in our obedience: which I never thought, I never said; I have spoken, and written much to the contrary.

Ans. 1. It is untruly here said by the Doctor, that the thing by him affirmed was, that our serving God, that we may fly from the wrath to come, was part of an evil end, when, and as it makes up one entire end by being mixed with sundry other things expressly mentioned: And for the discovery of the the falshood of that his affirmation, I need say no more, than to request the Reader to cast his Eye backwards upon the Doctors own words, as they have been recited both by himself, in his late Book, p. 52. and transcribed by me, p. 9. of this

Postscript

Post
eye
2
was
by h
ing
cont
and
Tha
no. v
to th
ther
as to
my l
in su
as th
stion
can I
may
derst
thor
ning
to? F
make
blam
son o
of m
accut
disbo
mean
deep
3.
ly re
word
p. 15
he d

Postscript ; and thereupon let him believe his own eyes.

2. The thing which he here says (but untruly) was affirmed by him is, as now it seems, the sense by himself intended in those words of his concerning the *Gibeonites* so called ; and that orthodox construction, which he would have had my self and others to make of them. To which I reply, That forasmuch as this his construction was no ways obvious to me, nor (as I verily think) to the understanding of any common Reader ; I do therefore judge my self altogether excusable (both as to my Intellectuals, and more especially as to my Morals) not to have understood his said words in such a sense, as is here expressed by him : For as the *Eunuch* said to *Philip* in answer to his Question (*Understandest thou what thou readest ?*) *How can I, except some one should guide me ?* in like sort may I fitly here say for my self, How could I understand the sense aforesaid to be intended by the Author without an Interpreter, or except such a cunning man as the Dr. himself should guide me thereunto? Forasmuch therefore as I did with all faithfulness make a relation of his words , although he had blamed me for dulness of apprehension, or as a person of an inferiour wit (suitable to the inferiority of my condition ;) nevertheless he had no colour to accuse me (as he doth) of any immorality or dishonesty, because I did not fish out that his said meaning, not having an understanding to dive so deep as certain other men, or as he himself.

3. The Doctor doth here to my seeming plainly retract, or contradict what he had said in those words of his at large recited in my Discourse, p. 159. from his Book *Comm.* p. 185. For whereas he doth here acknowledge, that it may be a part

of a good end to serve God, to fly from the wrath to come, he doth there seem altogether to deny it, and wholly to exclude it from such an end; For he doth there assert, that we are freed from obedience to this end, that we may obtain life everlasting, and that we are not to work for life. Now not to obey, that we may obtain life everlasting, and not to work for life, is the self-same thing as not to obey and work, that we may escape everlasting death, which in very deed is the wrath to come, and is so styled in Scripture; so that what the Doctor here says [He never thought, He never said] it seems sufficiently plain, that (whatever he thought) he there (in the place forecited) did say; and it seems also, that he doth now retract, or contradict what he had said, he here acknowledging, that it maybe a part of a good end to fly from the wrath to come; whereas before he had in positive and absolute terms wholly and altogether (as any one had reason to judge by his words) excluded it from any such end.

3. I had no design at all, nor was it ever in my thoughts to insinuate, that the Doctor did deny, that our obeying God to fly from the wrath to come, might in any sense be a part of a good end in our obedience; for I know very well that there is scarce any thing affirmed, but that it may in some sense be denied; or denied, but that it may in some certain sense be affirmed, e. g. These Propositions [there is no God; God is not to be worshipped, served, supplicated unto---] may with safety of truth in some sense be affirmed, (*i. e.*) There is no such God, as the *Anthropomorphites* fancy God to be; God is not to be worshipped and served, as if he needed any thing, or could be profited by our Service; or to be prayed unto, as if he did not know our wants before we make them known

known---so that the Doctor may affirm any thing, or deny any thing, yea the same thing; and yet in some sense make it good or true: And what his sense is, wherein he denies it not, that it might be a part of a good end to obey God, to fly from the wrath to come, he was so wise as not to declare, but to keep to himself; whereupon no man living is able to gainsay that his secret sense, nor to abett it.

4. I observe, how cautiously, and like a wary man, the Doctor hath here expressed himself: For he durst not (I am sure he doth not) say, I denied not that it ought to be, but that it might be; neither did he say a good end, but a part of a good end; nor did he say simply, a part of a good end, but that it might be in any sense a part of a good end in our obedience to fly from the wrath to come. Will not all these cautionary expressions serve to bring off the Doctor, with what Weapons soever, or by what hand soever he be assaulted, or to what straits soever he be reduced? But I observe withal, notwithstanding the said Caution upon Caution, how bold the Prophets and Apostles of old were: for the Prophet *Amos* was bold to say, *seek good and not evil, that ye may live.* The Prophet *Jeremy* is bold, and saith, *O Jerusalem, wash thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayst be saved.* And *St. Paul* also is bold, and saith to the *Corinthians*, *so run, that ye may obtain.* And I observe also the usual boldness of *Catechistical Writers* in asserting positively, absolutely and *rorundis verbis*, that to fly from the wrath to come ought to be a sinners main and great end: For to these Questions, What is the chief end of man? and what ought to be the chief and continual care of every man in this life? The answers are, Mans chief end is to glorifie God and to enjoy him for ever: and Mans chief and continual care in

this life ought to be the glorifying of God, and the saving of his own Soul. These are the prime Questions and Answers in those two well known Catechisms, commonly styled the *Assemblies* and *Mr. Ball's* Catechism.

5. What was ever spoken, or written by the Doctor to the contrary of what he was by me charged with (*i.e.*) his asserting, that Jesus Christ hath freed us from obedience for this end, namely, That we may obtain life everlasting, or (which is all one) that we may fly from the wrath to come, for my own part I do not know, nor do I think myself culpable for that my ignorance; although the Doctor supposing my knowledge thereof, doth charge me as the more heinously criminal in his following words saying, p. 53.

And yet to countenance himself in this disingenuous procedure, besides many other untrue reflections, he adds, that insinuate, that those, whom I describe, are Christians, that seek Righteousness by Faith in Christ, p. 167.

Ans. The Doctor doth still persist in his egregious slanders, by imputing to me untrue reflections, yea a multitude of untrue reflections, whereof not so much as any one hath he proved against me; only as to the insinuation here said to be added by me, I doubt not, but that I shall be able to justify the ground of it to the sense of every intelligent and impartial Reader by my Answers following,

1. Be it considered, that the persons described by him, were by him styled *Gibeonites*. Now what were the *Gibeonites*, or what manner of persons? They were Profelytes to the Jewish Religion, such as the Prophet *Isaiab*, describes (*ch. 56. 6.*) *Strangers that joyned themselves to the Lord, to serve him, to love the Name of the Lord, to be his Servants* —

as appears by the Story of their professed conversion and dedition of themselves to the Captain General of Gods host, *Josh. 9. 9.* they thereupon exposing themselves to the hazard of their Lives from the Confederate Borderers, no less than *Rahab* did her self by her entertaining the Spies, as appears by the process of the Story concerning them, *Josh. 10.* 'Tis true indeed, that being taken into covenant and protection, they were put to the meanest Services belonging to the Tabernacle; they were such, as to whom that description given of my person doth fitly agree (*i.e.*) persons of an inferior condition (and if the Doctor barely upon that score had pointed me out by the Name of a *Gibeonite*, it would not have offended me;) but notwithstanding the inferiority of their condition and imployment, they were Servants of the true God, the God of *Israel*, and professedly therefore such, as did seek Righteousness by Faith in the Messias, as did the faithful Jews under the Old Testament. Now the persons here spoken of by the Doctor going under this express denomination [*Gibeonites*] I appeal to the Reader, whether I did wrong him by inferring, that he did insinuate the persons here spoken of by him to be such as sought Righteousness by Faith in Christ; for were not the *Gibeonites* such persons, as did so seek Righteousness, as was before proved? But that the Reader might not observe them to be such, the Doctors craftiness in concealing the word [*Gibeonites*] is notable, yea, in falsifying my report of his words, as was before intimated in another Paragraph, the suggestion of the reason of it being for this place reserved: For whereas his words, as by me transcribed from his own Book [*Communion of Saints*] were (there be *Gibeonites*) he reports them thus (some

there be) as designing to delude the Reader by making him to believe, that the persons here spoken of were not *Gibeonites* (*i. e.*) such as did seek Righteousness by the Messiah ; or at least he did falsifie as aforesaid, that the Readers might not observe them to be such.

2. That it is an undue end for true Believers (such Christians as do now seek Righteousness by Faith in Christ) to serve God, namely, that they may fly from the wrath to come, is a thing not only insinuated, but also plainly asserted by the Doctor, as hath been already manifested, and as is further manifest by his words recited in my Discourse, p. 168. he saying, *that the obedience of the Saints is the way of walking in the life, they have received; not the way of working for the life they have not.* Now forasmuch as the Life, which as yet the Saints have not, is the life of Glory, and it being denied by him that the Saints do, or are to work for this life, is it not plain, that he doth make it an undue end to do the works of God, or to obey God for this end, namely, That they may be glorified, saved, or escape the wrath to come, one part of which wrath is the loss of Heaven? But oh, how contrary is this to the practice of the Apostle related by himself, *Phil. 3. 12, 13, 14.* and this to give us an example as appears, *v. 15. 17 ?*

The Doctor proceeds in his next words to make a remarkable profession of his Faith as to one Article thereof, saying, p. 53, *I must needs tell my Author, that my Faith in this matter is, that such works as these will have no influence in his justification; and that the principal reason, why I suppose, I shall not in my progress in this Discourse take any particular notice of his exceptions, either against the truth, or me, next unto this consideration, that*
they

they
to be
Aut
not
ful
and

being
that
for v
christ
here
fruits
dead
disho
in use
in Pa
an in
himse
me th
where
excl
gined,
I cann
may h
unawa
cessity
no M
told.

2. T
Doctor
fession
object
also to
good w

they are all trite and obsolete, and as to what seemeth to be of any force in them, will occur to me in other Authors, from whom they are derived, is, that I may not have continual occasion to declare, how forgetful he hath been of all the Rules of ingenuity, yea and of common honesty in his dealing with me.

*Ans^r. Our Doctor hath spoken falsely (himself being his own Judge) in pretending a necessity, that he must needs tell me his Faith as afore related: for what professed Christian is of a Faith so unchristian, as to believe, or think, that the works here reflected on by him (works of darkness, fruits of the flesh, works of the Devil, dead works, deadly works, works of more than Heathenish dishonesty, works short of common honesty, being in usual construction such honesty as is not wanting in Pagans) that these works, I say, should have an influence in his justification? Let the Doctor himself be Judge of the no necessity of his telling me this his private Faith, forasmuch as he elsewhere says, p. 535. *To what purpose should the Apostle exclude evil works from our justification? whoever imagined, that any could be justified with respect to them?* I cannot say, I must necessarily, yet I will say, that I may hereupon fitly tell our Doctor, that he hath at unawares condemned himself in pretending a necessity to tell me that, which by his own confession no Man can be imagined to have need to be told.*

2. The very truth is, as I am perswaded, our Doctor thought it a thing necessary by the said profession of his private Faith, to expose me as a fit object for publick scorn and contempt, and partly also to upbraid me for the maintaining of some good works of our own in order to our justification before

before God. And this being my perswasion touching his real intent in that Sarcasm, I think it not amiss in this place to tell the Reader, what is my plain Faith touching this matter, *viz.* Although I know and believe, that no good works of ours (our very best works not excepted) have any causal influence into, or upon our justification, or are any the least ingredient therein (And for this reason I do renounce and abhor such odious and absurd Language, as is frequently used by this Doctor and many other prejudicate Brethren, whereby to disguise the true sense of their Adversaries, as if they introduced works into justification, made them ingredients of the thing, or asserted works to have any causal influx in, or into it;) nevertheless I am perswaded, and do verily believe, that there are certain good works (*viz.* Faith and Repentance, together with a sincere purpose of heart for amendment of life) which God, who justifieth, doth require to be (through his grace enabling) performed by Sinners as the condition of their justification; and I mean the word [condition] in no other sense, than our Doctor seems to allow the use of it in this case (see his late Book p. 154.) I mean, my Faith is, that the said good works (repentance and a sincere purpose of heart to cleave to the Lord in the way of well-doing) are duties together with Faith required of sinners by Jesus Christ in his Gospel, in order to their justification, or that they may be justified; and upon the performance whereof they shall for the promise sake of God, and for the Righteousness sake of Christ, certainly and infallibly be justified (*i.e.*) absolved, acquitted, discharged from the guilt of their sins, freed from condemnation, or saved from the punishment deserved, or contracted by their sins.

This is that which the Doctor doth so expressly and frequently in his late Book deny and argue against, affirming, that Faith alone is the means or condition of our justification, p. 96, 445, & *passim.*

m
I
ex
te
C
no

qu
ed
am
En
Boo
hav
was
Dis
ful
not
at t
imp
appe
A
ver
triu
fals
an h
with
fals
I.
trans
to be
for th
tion
of Be
other
(to m

My Accuser having dispatcht his business with me in those four Pages together (p. 50, 51, 52, 53.) I hear no more from him till p. 70. wherein taking exception against what I had said in the first Chapter of my Discourse concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us as a phrase expressly not to be found in Scripture, thereupon he says,

And thus although a sufficient answer hath frequently enough (if any thing can be so) been returned to the objection in Bellarmine; yet hath one of late amongst our selves made the translation of it into English to be the substance of the first Chapter of a Book about justification: though he needed not to have given such an early intimation, unto whom he was beholding for the greatest part of his ensuing Discourse, unless it be in what is taken up in despiteful reviling of other men; for take from him what is not his own on the one hand, and impertinent cavils at the words and expressions of other men, with forged imputations on the other, and his whole Book will disappear.

Ans. One would be apt to think, that my Adversaries intent was to run me down, and to gain a triumph over me by oppressing me with an heap of falsehoods and slanders; this whole Paragraph being an heap of naught else but such ingredients, wherein with his slanderous Pen he hath piled falsehood upon falsehood, and calumny upon calumny: for,

1. It is falsely said by him, that I have made the translation of *Bellarmines* objection into English to be the Subject of the first Chapter in my Book; for the very truth is, I never did make the translation of any one Sentence (objection or answer) of *Bellarmino* in any part of my Book, nor in any other Book which I ever wrote, or Sermon, that (to my best remembrance) I did ever Preach.

2. It

2. It is with more falshood here said by him, that I was beholding to *Bellarmino* for the greatest part of my ensuing Discourse, for I have not served my self of one line (to my knowledge) in, or out of the Books of *Bellarmino* in any part of my Discourse.

3. It is still with more falshood said of me, that the greatest part of my Discourse (except before excepted) is taken up in despitelul reviling of other men: For although I have contradicted some men, perhaps many; yet I have reviled no man.

4. And still with more falshood doth he charge me with impertinent cavilling, as at the words of other men, so with forged imputations on some of them; all these Accusations being *gratis dicta*, his own forgeries, and meer slanders, of which he hath given into my Bosome measure pressed down, shaken together, and running over. But blessed be God, that (for ought hitherto my Accuser hath made to appear) I am able to justifie my self, and that, as I hope, my Book it self will justifie me against all the said heinous Crimes here laid to my charge, the proof whereof he hath not so much as attempted to make, nor yet instancing here in any one particular of reviling, and forgery, whereby to discover any real guilt, whether to my own Conscience, or to any other Man or Men.

5. As for the disappearing of my whole Book (that being taken from me, which is not my own---) for as much as it is a reflection upon me in point of my Ministerial Disability, but not of any unchristian Immorality, although it were never so notoriously false; nevertheless I shall altogether leave it to the learned Reader to judge, with what truth and integrity he hath utter'd those words. Only I will say, That my Delator in all probability will

say
bo
cou
say
men
than
ther
bilio
lity
me,
bein
I be
acco
T
p. 7
Ba
testa
Righ
them
kept
swere
that
(the
Doct
but th
Righ
Righ
is, so
we are
the fo
herita
makes
did, a
we do
for if
own pe

say the same concerning all that I have written, both in this, and in the second part of my Discourse: which if he shall say (for what will he not say, that tends to my diminution and disparagement in any kind?) my answer shall be no other than is here given, *viz.* I do wholly leave it to others to judge of my Ministerial gifts, or defects, abilities, or disabilities, as they see cause; my morality or immorality (as to which it highly concerns me, even as I hope to be saved, to acquit my self) being not at all concerned in such suggestions. So I be not in account a wicked Minister, let who will account me weak.

The Doctor proceeds after his manner saying, p. 70. 71.

But yet although he affirms, that none of the Protestant Writers, who speak of the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ unto us (which were all of them without exception till of late) have precisely kept to the form of wholesome words; but have rather swerved, or varied from the language of Scripture in that saying, yet he will excuse them from open error, (the word open, was not mine, but is here of the Doctors putting in) if they intend no more thereby, but that we are made partakers of the benefits of the Righteousness of Christ: But if they intend that the Righteousness of Christ itself is imputed unto us (that is, so as to be our Righteousness before God, whereon we are pardoned and accepted with him, or do receive the forgiveness of sins, and a right to the Heavenly inheritance) then are they guilty of that error, which makes us to be esteemed to do our selves what Christ did, and so on the other side Christ to have done what we do and did, ch. 2. 3. But these things are not so: for if we are esteemed to have done any thing in our own persons, it cannot be imputed unto us as done for

us by another, as it will appear when we shall treat of these things afterwards.

Ans. 1. The Doctor hath spoken untruly, and (as rationally may be presumed) contrary to his own knowledge in his first parenthesis, asserting therein, That all Protestants without exception, till of late, have abetted the Imputation of Christs Righteousness in the sense opposed in my Discourse; for he cannot be ignorant, that many eminent Protestant writers, both in our own, and in foreign Churches have long since opposed the said Imputation of Christs Righteousness in the sense by me opposed, allowing and defending the Imputation thereof only in the sense by me acknowledged and maintained. And in what sense I have expressly owned the imputation of Christs Righteousness to us in the third Chapter of my Discourse, the Doctor, I confess, hath here rightly reported: But as to the explication or declaration of the sense disallowed by me, he hath palpably and most unconscionably wronged me by misreporting the same; for the manifestation of which wrong I am here necessitated to transcribe my own words in the 7th page of my Discourse, wherein I do express the said sense disowned by me, as followeth.

To assert the Righteousness of Christ in the proper and formal sense of the word [righteousness] to be imputed to us, is a Doctrine, however owned by too too many, yet by very many others of our own and foreign Protestant Churches justly disowned, as that which is no where to be found in Scripture: for to assert, that Christs Righteousness is in this sense imputed to us, is to assert, that God doth account, or reckon, that the righteousness which Christ wrought, we wrought in and by him; or that we are reputed by God to have fulfilled the Law and satisfied Divine justice

justice in and by Christ, that what Christ did in his own natural person, God doth account, we did in and by him; for to have any thing imputed to a Man in the propriety, formality, or essential nature of the thing, is to be reputed the doer of what is so imputed to him, these being terms equivalent and explicatory one of another; And as thus explicated do the Brethren, whom I take upon me in this point to oppose, openly own the said Doctrine touching the imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, it being their error to think, that Christs Righteousness cannot be accepted by God in our behoof, or prove savingly beneficial to us, unless it be imputed to us in their said sense.

Now let my own explication of the sense of the imputation of Christs Righteousness opposed by me, and here transcribed out of Discourse, p. 7, 8. be compared with the foresaid misrepresentation thereof by the Doctor, and his most dishonest unchristian dealing with me will evidently appear: for,

1. Instead of the explication of the said sense (disowned by me) in my own words here transcribed, he would make the Reader to believe, that I do oppose it in the sense expressed by himself in this his parenthesis (*That is, so as to be our Righteousness before God, whereon we are pardoned and accepted with him, or do receive the forgiveness of sins, and a right to the Heavenly inheritance*) whereas I never did, nor ever will I oppose the imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us in the sense, as is specified by the Doctor in this said parenthesis; Yea I do readily acknowledge the Imputation of it so far forth, or in that sense, it being all one as to say, that Christs Righteousness is indeed before God the meritorious cause, whereon we are pardoned and accepted with God — and that as such it is imputed in our behalf,

half, we enjoying the saving effects thereof, or benefits thereby purchased.

2. The thing inferred by me in my Discourse is not as he hath here expressed it in his own words before related [*If they intend, that the Righteousness of Christ it self is imputed to us, then are they guilty of that error, which makes us to be esteemed to do our selves what Christ did, and so on the other side, Christ to have done what we do and did:*] but my inference was, that then they are guilty of error in asserting, that God doth account or reckon, that the righteousness which Christ wrought, we wrought in and by him, or that we are reputed by God to have fulfilled the Law and satisfied Divine justice (not we our selves to have done these things, as the Doctor misrepresents my words, but) in and by Christ. And as this was my inference in the words here transcribed out of my Discourse, so also I did assert, and that most truly (which is a material matter here craftily concealed by the Doctor) that the thing inferred was it, which the Brethren, whom in this Controvertie I oppose, do professedly own in the very terms, as by me their sense is expressed from their own Books and Writings.

To be esteemed to have done in and by Christ, what Christ did, is to be esteemed not to have done it in our own persons.

3. Whereas he says, that if we are esteemed to have done any thing in our own persons, it cannot be imputed unto us, as done for us by another, as it will appear when he will treat of these things afterwards ; I reply, that this makes nothing at all against what was by me inferred from the imputation of Christs Righteousness unto us in its formal and essential nature, which indeed was not as the Doctors words do here imply, *viz.* That we are esteemed to have done in our own persons, what Christ did ; But my inference was, that we are esteemed to have done in and by Christ what Christ

did ;

did ; so that although what the Doctor doth here say may be true, *viz.* That if we are esteemed to have done any thing in our own persons, it cannot be imputed to us as done for us by another ; my inference and the thing by me inferred is nevertheless true, *viz.* That to have any thing imputed to a Man in the propriety, formality, or essential nature of the thing is to be reputed the doer of what is so imputed to him ; this consequence as the Brethren whom I oppose do not deny, so the consequent it self they do expressly own. The premisses considered, the Doctors after-pains (here promised) to make that appear, which is nothing at all unto, but altogether beside the purpose in hand, will appear to be vain and needless, if not ridiculous.

The Doctors next onset is, *p.* 288. where he mentions me by Name, and having there argued for the Imputation of the guilt of our sin to Christ, by me disowned (my perswasion being this, *viz.* That Christ did not take upon him our guilt or culpability, or our obligation thereupon to suffer, but an obligation at the will of his Father, peculiar to himself, he suffering in our stead, and our iniquities being laid upon him in such a sense, as the sins of the Sacrificers were laid upon the Sacrifice, the innocent Beast dying instead of the Offender ; whereas the perswasion of them, I suppose, is, that Christ took upon him that same guilt or obligation to punishment, which we by our sins had contracted, and that in this sense God laid upon him the iniquities of us all) the Doctor I say, having there argued for the imputation of our guilt to Christ, or of our obligation to suffering unto Christ, he says respectively to my self in the words here following,

D

Without

Without a supposition hereof it cannot be understood, how the Lord Christ should be our *Ἀντίτυπος*, or suffer *ἀντὶ ἡμῶν*, in our stead, unless we will admit the exposition of Mr. Hotchkis a late Writer, who reckoning up many things the Lord Christ did in our stead, adds, as the sense thereof, that is to bestead us; than which if he can invent any thing more fond and senseless, he hath a singular faculty in such an Employment.

Ans. 1. What he here says cannot be understood, I have in my Discourse both against him and Mr. Fergusen made obvious to any unprejudicate person of common understanding; neither do I perceive, that the Doctor hath so much as attempted in his late Book to answer my arguings; and therefore as I said in my Discourse, so I say still, that Jesus Christ having assumed to, or upon himself an obligation to suffer (although not our obligation, but an obligation of another kind than ours) may well be said to be our *Ἀντίτυπος*, and to have suffered in our stead, because he suffered that, which was equivalent to the suffering, which being due to us we should have suffered, and therefore to save us from suffering. This is the explication which I gave concerning Christs suffering in our stead, or as our *Ἀντίτυπος*, p. 70. of my Discourse.

2. To free my self from all, the least colour of suspicion of Socinianism I did concerning Christs dying in our stead assert more, than he himself did allow, affirming that, which he did deny; and because he hath here dealt so unconscionably and unchristianly with me, as to mention only these words of mine (Christ did thus in our stead (*i.e.*) to bestead us) as if he would have every Reader to believe that I am a perfect Socinian (for the whole Tribe of Socinians will acknowledge, that Christ

C
am
of
to
21
ma
J. C
our
kno
was
is e
ing,

A
Pla
Thi
Did
Obe
mon
ciall
The
(Bot
A Sa
As T
bedie
Of H
Man
dienc
Beste
Us 1
Life
The G
Perfor

Christ died in our stead (*i. e.*) to bestead us); I am therefore again necessitated (for the shaming of my Accuser, and for the clearing of my self) to transcribe my own words at large out of the 214, 215. page of my Discourse, wherein I did make profession of my Faith, that whereas Doctor J. O. doth deny the death of Christ to have been in our stead as it was a Price, and a Sacrifice (he acknowledging it to have been in our stead only as it was a punishment) the profession of my Faith is expressed at large in the words here following,

After All This Dispute, I Do Freely And Plainly Confess, And Acknowledge, And This I Do Without Any Of Doctor Owens Distinctions ; That All Christs Mediatory Obedience To Any Law Whatsoever (Common To Us, Or Peculiar To Himself) Especially His Obedience To The Death Of The Cross, Was Under All Considerations (Both As A Penalty, As A Price, And As A Sacrifice) In Our Stead; And Forasmuch As The Dignity, Or Value Of All His Obedience Did Depend Upon The Dignity Of His Person (He Being Both God And Man) I Do Confess, That All His Obedience Was In Our Stead (That Is) To Bestead Us, And That It Did Bestead Us In The Purchasing Of A Pardon, And Life Eternal For Us, Upon Terms In The Gospel Promised To Us, And Upon Performance Thereof To Be Conferr'd Up-

on Us; And That The Said Obedience Of Christ (Both Active And Passive, As It Is Usually Styled) Is Imputed To Us, Although Not Immediately And In It Self, Yet To As Much Purpose, And Real Benefit, As If It Were Actually, Or Could Possibly Be So Imputed (i.e.) That It Is Imputed To Us In All Its Saving Fruits, And Blessed Effects, All That His Foresaid Obedience Making Up One Entire Meritorious Cause Of All The Said Benefits, And Blessings.

This large profession and explication of my belief concerning the person of Christ, and concerning all his mediatory obedience (both his doings and sufferings) its being in our stead, I wrote in my Discourse in such sort as I have here transcribed it (i.e.) every word beginning with a great Letter, that every Reader (Friends and Foes) might the rather observe and remember it, yet the Doctor it seems, was neither willing himself to take notice of it, nor willing that it should have been taken notice of by any other. The explication of my professed belief in the Article, or Articles aforesaid being thus transcribed, I leave to the Reader what judgment to make of the Doctors censure, he saying [*That if I can invent any thing more fond and senseless, I have a singular faculty in such an employment,*] Yea, what judgment to make of the Doctor himself for this his censure, and for this manner of dealing with me and my Writings: And I leave it also to the judgment of every impartial Man, what manner of faculty and invention is hereupon to be ascribed to the Doctor,

and

and
son,
he d
thro
T
hath
He
tion
and
p. 18
Th
(that
right
teoul
about
Hotc
And
unpro
That
phet,
For b
God i
the pla
tion gi
is call
of Rig
Righte
teousne
him, n
Any
me as
which
consci
over,
or atte
sop sha

and what manner of imployment is fit for a person, that will make no more Conscience of what he doth, or what he says, than he hath manifested throughout every page in his dealing with me.

The fourth and last place, wherein the Doctor hath to do with me by Name, is in p. 386, 387. He therein taking exceptions against my exposition of two Texts of Scripture, *Zech. 3. 3, 4, 5.* and *Isaiah 61. 10.* mentioned in my Discourse, p. 180, and 198. his words are as followeth,

This place I had formerly urged to this purpose (that is, that by the change of Raiment, and Robe of righteousness in the said Scripture is meant the Righteousness of Christ imputed to us, or put upon us) about Communion with God, p. 187. which Mr. Hotchkis in his usual manner attempts to answer. And to omit his reviling expressions, with the crude unproved assertion of his own conceits, his answer is, That by the change of Raiment mentioned by the Prophet, our own personal Righteousness is intended. For he acknowledgeth, that our justification before God is here represented. And so also he expounds the place produced in the confirmation of the exposition given Isaiah 61. 10. where this change of Raiment is called the Garments of Salvation, and the Robe of Righteousness; and therein affirms, that our Righteousness it self before God is our personal Righteousness, p. 103. That is in our justification before him, which is the only thing in question.

Ans. 1. The Doctor doth still persist to charge me as guilty of reviling expressions (among which he doth not instance in any, nor am I conscious to my self of any one) intimating moreover, that this is my usual manner of answering, or attempting to answer. If any intelligent person shall vouchsafe impartially to peruse those two

Chapters (*ch.* 30, and 34.) where I make answer to those two objected Scriptures, *Isa.* 61. 10. and *Zech.* 3. 3, 4, 5. And if he doth not find, that my Book there doth justify it self and me to his Conscience as guiltless of the Crime here imputed to me (Reviling expressions) let him come forth in Gods Name and stone me, as the Delator here hath done, with accusations thick and three-fold.

2. I did, and still do acknowledge, that in the vision of the Prophet *Zech.* there is a representation of justification, or remission of sin and sanctification / and that as the former is represented by the phrase (Gods causing the Prophets iniquities to pass from him) so is the later by the fine change of Raiment / and the Doctor himself cannot but know, how well I am seconded by several of the best Commentators in that interpretation, whom were it needful I would here produce. And as for that in *Isa.* 61. 10. as I did in my Discourse declare my thoughts, so I am still of the same mind, *viz.* That by Righteousness is there meant Gods beneficence and bounty, with the several fruits of it conferr'd upon his Church in their preservations, deliverances, restorations — (the word Righteousness being in this sense of frequent use in Scripture) and that by Gods covering them with the Garment of Salvation and the Robe of Righteousness (it being an allusion to the Custome of all Nations, which was, and still is to clothe themselves suitably to their present condition, whether of prosperity or adversity, fasting or feasting times) is meant the great goodness and bounty of God (let the particulars in the retail thereof, whether in temporals, or spirituals, or in both, be what they will) promised, or manifested to his Church,
and

and manifested by them in a suitable manner of open and solemn rejoycing for them. Neither is this interpretation the crude and unproved assertion of my own conceits, as will appear to any Reader, upon his perusal of what I have in my Discourse said for the proof of it; although my Censor, who hath taken liberty to himself to say of me and mine, whatsoever pleaseth himself, is pleased here to say as he doth, shooting his Bolt after his usual manner. But if he hath any thing in the next Paragraph to disprove my said interpretation of the sayings of those two Prophets, it shall be there considered with a just reply thereunto. In the mean while I am to answer to what I am charged to have said in the 23. page of my Discourse, *viz.* That our Righteousness it self before God is our personal Righteousness, to which I make answer.

1. The Doctor hath greatly wronged me by making an imperfect relation of my words, omitting those words of mine in the self same page, wherein as I do assert, that our Righteousness it self before God is our personal Righteousness; so I do there expressly acknowledge also, that the Righteousness of Christ is in a causal sense our Righteousness before God, this also being my assertion in p. 87. and also in p. 182. of my Discourse, wherein was asserted, that this Proposition [Christ's Righteousness is a Sinners clothing] is true, *prædicatione causali*, though not *essentiali*, or *formali*, as are the School-terms.

2. I am not indeed of the same mind with the Doctor and many other of my Brethren, *viz.* That Christ's Righteousness is our sole Righteousness in our justification before God, he saying p. 295. of his late Book, *that Christ's whole obedience unto*

God in all that he did and suffered for the Church, is that which is imputed to Believers; and that this is imputed to them so, as to become their only Righteousness before God unto the justification of life.

Whereas my perswasion, which I am not afraid or ashamed openly to own, is plainly this, viz. There is a threefold Righteousness concurrent, or requisite in, unto, or towards the justification of a Sinner in the sight of God, each of which truly are, and may well be said to be a sinners righteousness before God, viz. 1 The Righteousness of Jesus Christ the Son of God; this is that Righteousness which is the meritorious cause of our justification. And in this sense it is most true to say, that Christs Righteousness is *in suo genere*, or of its kind, our only Righteousness before God unto the justification of life. And in this sense it is also true to say (although indeed it be no Scriptural expression) that Christs Righteousness is imputed to Believers as their only Righteousness (*i. e.*) so as to be reckoned or reputed the only Righteousness that hath merited, or meritoriously procured their justification unto life.

2. Forgiveness of sin, as it doth frequently in the New Testament go under the Name of Righteousness, and is a true Righteousness in its kind (as hath been at large proved and opened in my second part) so is it that Righteousness which doth *ingredi naturam rei*, it is the formal constituent Cause, or that which doth constitute a sinners justification before God; I mean that justification of a sinner, which is promised in the Gospel to be conferr'd upon him for the righteousness sake of Christ, conditionally upon his Faith, such a working Faith as was that of *Abraham*. And as was said in my Discourse, so I say again, with this Righteousness a sinner may
with

with boldness appear before the Judgment Seat of God, even as a Malefactor may at the Bar with the Kings pardon in his Hand or Bosome.

3. a sinners faithful performance of the conditions required in the Gospel, upon which God hath promised to them the justification of life, truly is, and may well be said in that respect, and so far forth to be their righteousness before God: and both these later kinds of Righteousnesses being through Gods gift our own, and whereof we are the Subjects, may fitly be styled for that reason our Personal Righteousness. The Premises considered, all the toresaid several sorts of Righteousnesses (Christs Righteousness and our own) may be said in several respects to be or Righteousness before God, as was said and distinctly opened in the 139th page of my Discourse. Hereupon let me commend to observation, how false that imputation of the Doctor is (p. 221, 222. of his late Book; and which to my remembrance is several times repeated by him) he saying, *That those, who place the whole of justification in the remission of sins, making our personal Righteousness the condition of it, leave not any place for the Righteousness of Christ:* For although I stick not to declare my self to be one of those, who do assert, That the whole of that justification, which God hath promised to believing sinners, doth consist in the forgiveness of their sins, and that our personal Righteousness (consisting (summarily) in our return to God by Faith and Repentance) is the condition of enjoying it (altogether despising the imputation of Socinianism upon account of these assertions;) nevertheless I most explicitly and expressly leave a place, a prime place, a peculiar place to the Righteousness of Christ in our justification
(i.e.)

(i. e.) the place of a meritorious Cause.

And as touching the difference, or differences betwixt the said threefold Righteousness asserted to be requisite to the justification of a sinner in the sight of God, I shall commend to observation the following particulars,

1. The first and the third kind of righteousness are extrinsecal, or extrinsically requisite to the justification of a sinner before God (the first being the efficient cause, the third the condition thereof,) but the second is intrinsecal to a sinners justification, it being (as was before said) the form, or thing it self, which constitutes a sinner justified, or that justification of a sinner, which Christ hath purchased, and God hath promised conditionally upon Faith in Christ.

2. The second kind of Righteousness is requisite *ex naturâ rei*, it being a natural impossibility, that a sinner should be *Rectus in curiâ*, should be justified or made righteous respectively to the sanction, or retributive part of the Law, but by a pardon, whereby his obligation to punishment due by Law is dissolved. But the other two kinds of Righteousness are requisite *ex lege dei*, they are made necessary to a sinners justification By, or From the Law or Covenant of God, and this twofold,

1. The Law of the Mediatour, that Law which was imposed by God the Father upon Christ (commonly called the Covenant of Redemption) and by which Christs Mediatory righteousness was made necessary to the meriting the justification of believing sinners, Christ being for this end commanded to lay down his life: *John 10. 18.*

2. As for the third kind of Righteousness, it is requisite, or necessary to a sinners justification by vertue of the Covenant of Grace with Mankind,

or

or the Law of Faith (as is the Apostles expression, *Rom. 3, last.*) wherein the terms imposed upon us in order to our justification are expressed, upon which it is promised, and without the performance of which it shall not be enjoyed; neither without this performance can it be enjoyed, either according to the tenour of the Covenant of God with us sinners, or with Christ in our behoof; forasmuch as by vertue of the agreement betwixt him and his Father, he was to merit our justification to be enjoyed upon performance of the said terms, and not otherwise.

Now if the Doctor hath ought to say, whereby to disprove what I have said as to the interpretation of those two Texts in *Zech. 3. 4, 5.* and *Isa. 61, 10.* I am ready to reply thereunto, which is the next work incumbent upon me after the recital of his words here following,

To all which presumptions I shall oppose only the testimony of the same Prophet, which he may consider at his leisure, and which at one time or other he will subscribe unto, Isa. 64, 6. We are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. He, who can make Garments of Salvation and Robes of righteousness of these filthy rags, hath a skill in composing Spiritual vestments, that I am not acquainted withall.

Ans. 1. I have long ago had leisure to consider, and I have intently considered those words of the Prophet *Isaiah*, and I do subscribe to them; but I cannot at this time subscribe to that construction, which the Doctor would have me to make of them, nor I think, shall I ever do it at any other time; the words of the Prophet being indeed no Testimony to, or for what the Doctor would compell them to bear witness to, viz. to prove that there is no
Righteousness

Righteousness of our own, that is, or may be truly said to be our Righteousness before God unto the justification of life; or that Christs Righteousness is our only Righteousness for that purpose. For among that variety of interpretations, which are given by Commentators upon those words, the Doctor hath fixed upon that, which to my seeming is most improbable, and which is therefore justly rejected by *Gataker* and *Grotius* with many other most learned men and skilful Textuaries; and that for weighty reasons, which I could easily suggest and multiply. It may be here sufficient for me to say, that the Doctor doth two ways misexpound the words, and mistake the meaning of the Prophet (*i. e.*) both in respect of the persons themselves (the Subject) and in respect of the Righteousnesses (the Adjunct) of the persons there intended by the Prophet: for by the persons [We all] the Prophet doth not mean every individual person (the remnant to be saved, as is the expression of that Prophet, speaking of the small excepted number;) but he means the body, bulk, or generality of the People (as Mr. *Calvin* expounds it:) and by their Righteousnesses the Prophet doth not mean any saving Righteousness (such as accompanies Salvation, as is the Apostles expression *Heb. 6. 9.*) but that superficial, ceremonial, external Righteousness, which the body of the Jewish Nation did vainly boast of and confide in; Briefly, the Prophet doth there mean that Righteousness (withall its ingredients) which elsewhere he tells them, should not profit them, *Isa. 57, 12.* As for our personal habitual Righteousness (commonly styled saving Righteousness) it is styled in the language of Scripture A Divine nature, the Image of God, Christ formed in us — upon which account

account the Righteous are said to be *The glory of God, the excellent, more excellent than their Neighbours*--- And the works of Righteousness are said to be *fruits of the spirit, an odour of a sweet smell, a Sacrifice acceptable through Christ*---2 Pet. 1. 4. Gal. 4. 19. Eph. 4. 24. Col. 3. 10. Psal. 16. 3. Prov. 12. 26. 2 Cor. 3. 23. Eph. 5. 9. Phil. 4. 18.

2. That which the Doctor here calls, and would perswade us, that the Prophet calls *filthy rags*, Job doth not stick to call a *Robe* and a *Diademe*, Job 29. 14. and the Psalmist, *Raiment of Needlework, and clothing of wrought Gold*, Psal. 45. 13, 14. and Solomon, *An ornament of grace to our head, and chains about our neck*, Prov. 1. 9.

3. The skill, which the Doctor here says, he is not acquainted with, he may learn at his leisure, and that in a very short time, if he hath a mind to it; and for that purpose, although I do not expect that he should so far condescend as to learn of me, but rather disdain and scorn to be taught any skill in any kind by such an inferiour as my self; nevertheless, I will be bold to commend to his notice two skilful Artificers (work-men who needed not to be ashamed) who will acquaint him, that there is such a skill to be learned, to which he is, it seems, hitherto a professed Stranger; I mean, those two prime Apostles, St. Paul and St. Peter; who, both of them, do instruct the Woman-kind to compose Spiritual Vestments, I say not of filthy rags, but of materials so Nick-named by the Doctor, see 1 Pet. 3. 3, 4, 5, 6. 1 Tim. 2. 9, 10. The premisses considered, I hope, that the Readers will not suspect any rag, or remnant of popery in what I have said to correct the Doctors misexposition of the words of those two Prophets (*Isaiab* and *Zechariab*;) for the prevention of which suspicion (for *Abundans cautela non nocet*)

I. Be

1. Be it remembred, that I have left a peculiar place for the Righteousness of Jesus Christ in the justification of a sinner, even a Royal Throne, in which no Righteousness of ours must be set, or to which it may aspire or approach.

2. Be it remembred, that although I do deny, that the Saints personal Righteousness is by the Prophet *Isaiah* styled Filthy rags; I do nevertheless acknowledge, that there is Iniquity adhering to the best of our holy things, which doth therefore need pardon, as well as our unholy things, which are iniquity, the guilt of all which is taken away by a pardon from God through Christ, which pardon of sin is a sinners justification before God, it being a thing not to be imagined (which yet seems to be the common gross imagination of too too many) and, for ought as yet appears to me, of the Doctor himself, that God in justifying us, doth justifie us to be sinless, whereas the truth is, that God in justifying us doth for Christs sake only acquit and discharge us from condemnation, our sins notwithstanding.

The Doctor concludes all, that in his Book he says against me by Name, in the following words, p. 387.

What remains in the Chapter, wherein the Answer is given to that testimony of the Scripture, I shall take no notice of; it being after his accustomed manner, only a perverse wresting of my words unto such a sense, as may seem to countenance him in casting a reproach upon my self and others.

Ans. 1. What the Doctor cannot answer with sobriety of reason, he doth very wisely to take no notice of; but he doth very ill so to wrong himself and me by the repetition of his slanderous accusing

cusing me for wresting, perverse wresting his words, whereby to countenance my self in casting reproach upon him and others. In my own defence against this his Accusation I shall request the Reader, who is minded to judge betwixt me and my Accuser, to peruse that Chapter (*Chap. 30.* in my Discourse) and if he doth not acquit me from the Crime here charged upon me, I will say in the words of *Judah* to his Father *Jacob*, *Gen. 43. 9.* *Let me bear the blame for ever.* In the mean while let him know this, *viz.* That if my own Conscience did not acquit me to my self of this and all other immoralities charged upon me by my Adversary, I would be much more an abhorring to my self, than I can be to him, or to any other.

2. The words forecited being the Doctors last words at his parting with me (for I hear no more of him to the end of his Book) the Reader may observe two things; 1. How he hath spun the whole of what he hath said, referring to me with an even Thread, I mean, how uniform he hath been from first to last, even all along in his dealing with me: For as he began his onset, and continued his pursuit with one false Accusation or another (spleen, spite, petulancy, scurrility, wresting his words, reproaching, forgery, disingenuity, dishonesty from first to last in my dealing with him, reviling and many of these repeated) in such sort doth he here conclude, filling up the Ephah or measure of his sin. To all these his slanderous imputations put together, although by occasion of them I cannot but call to mind these words of the Psalmist (*What shall be given unto thee? or what shall be done unto thee, thou false tongue?*) Nevertheless I shall only make a reply
once

once for all in such words, as the Apostle being impeached at the Barr did Answer for himself before *Felix*, *Acts* 24. 13. saying, Neither hath this *Tertullus* the Orator, or Impleader (*Dr. J. O.*) as yet proved, neither is he ever able to prove the things (the immoralities) whereof he hath accused me; respectively to all and every of which I shall further say in my own defence, as did the same Apostle, being many ways traduced by his back Friends, *1 Cor.* 4. 4. *I know nothing by my self*; which if I did, I would both do and say with *Job* (*Ch.* 42. 6.) *I repent, and abhor my self in dust and ashes.* But let me say also with the same Apostle, Although I am not conscious to my self of any of that guilt here charged upon me by my Accuser, yet I am not thereby (absolutely, authentickly, decisively, finally) justified: For he that will judge (both the accuser and the accused) is the Lord; Nor is it he, who commends himself, that is approved, but whom the Lord commendeth, *2 Cor.* 10. 1.

2. The Reader may observe whether the Doctor spake true or false (that we may know how to take his word for time to come, especially when he speaks of himself) in his Epistle prefixed to his Book, wherein he says, *That he hath ascribed no opinion to any particular person, much less wrested the words of any, Reflected on their Persons, censured their Abilities, taken Advantages of presumed prejudices against them.*

What? Hath the Doctor like an Inhabitant of the Holy Hill of *Sion*, spoken the truth from his heart in those words of his? What? Hath he so pepper'd my Jacket, and smitten me hip and thigh with his slanderous tongue, and yet not at all reflected upon my Person, nor censured my Abilities?

bilities? What though this *Hotchkis* be a Person of an inferior condition (*è vulgo Cleri*, an obscure Countrey Minister?) Is he therefore in account no person at all? But forasmuch as undeniably I am some manner of Person, the Doctors vile reflexions upon me and manifold slanders (as before laid open) being considered, every impartial Reader will doubtless say of Him, that by that his professed denial (his reflecting upon any person) he hath no otherwise justified, or cleared himself, than that naughty Patch, of whom *Agur* said, She eateth, and wipeth her Mouth and faith, I have done no wickedness, *Prov.* 30.20. For my own part, I should greatly wonder that the fear of God had not effectually restrained him from his manifold slanders and unchristian dealing with me, were it not, that as he professeth to have great assurance of his Saintship, so it is his professed Doctrine (see my Discourse p.168, 169. *That the Rule of the Saints obedience is the Law of liberty, as divested of all its terrifying, threatening, damning, cursing power.* As to the fallhood of this saying I have spoken somewhat in my Discourse, p. 168, 169. But because I judge it to be very dangerous, and of woful tendency, I shall suggest two things more.

First, Besides the reason specified in my Discourse, why the Gospel of Christ is called by *St. James* the Law of liberty, there is this reason of it rendred by Learned expositors, and by them judged to be the prime and most proper reason, *viz.* Because it is, as most impartial in its commands, so also in its threatnings, threatening Hell and damnation *libere*, freely and without all manner of respect of persons to all presumptuous Transgressours, this being threatened to Believers themselves in case of their revolting and living as Unbelievers, or (to speak in the language of the Prophet *Ezek.* 18, 24.) *their turning away from their righteousness and committing iniquity, and doing according to all the abominations that the wicked man doth*, *Heb.* 10. 38. Whence that admonition, *Heb.* 4. 1. *Let us therefore fear,*

left a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. Hence also that exhortation to the serving of God with reverence and Godly fear, it being backt or seconded with these words (for our God is a consuming fire) *Heb. 12. 28, 29.* and this exhortation and consideration given and suggested to those, who at present were Heirs apparent of Heaven.

Secondly, That Eastern St. (holy *Job*, a Man celebrated for the fear of God, *Ch. 1. 1.*) was of another mind, than our Doctor in this point, as appears, in that he declares this to be a reason, why he did not despise the cause of his Man-servant or his Maid-servant (persons for ought I know of condition as inferiour as my self) saying (*Chap. 31. 23.*) *For Destruction from God was a Terrour to me.* Had any thing like to Destruction been a terrour to this Doctor, he would not have so despised, set at naught, belyed and slandered any Brother, however of a condition never so inferiour to himself. But that my Accuser may the rather perceive and lay to heart, what a grievous evil it is to transgress by false accusing and open calumniating, I shall put him in mind of his own words, *p. 541.* where he says,

False Accusations and open Calumnies are the worst of Evils, to which some will (of certain Papists he there speaks) *out of a perverse zeal to promote their own interest in the Religion they profess, wilfully give up themselves.* It is probable, that the word [*Διάβολος*] was in his mind, when he wrote those words, that word (the Devils common name) signifying a false Accuser. And if such were his thoughts, there is the more hope, that sooner or later he will seriously reflect who it is that did set him on work, or whose work he hath done in his open Calumnies and false Accusations of me from page to page in his late Book, wheresoever he mentions my Name. I hear he hath put forth a New Catechism, and I did very lately read some reflexions upon it by that judicious Author Mr. *Lambe*,
in

in his Book styled, *A fresh Suit against Independency*: I wish he had first learned to have put in practice our old one. He would then have kept himself from evil speaking, lying, and slandering. And if the Doctor did judge it somewhat useful to me to be warned of my Immoralities) [in truth not mine, but feigned by himself, and wrongfully imputed to me) it may well be thought to be more useful unto him to be warned of trespasses, truly and really, plainly and palpably His, as I have by many instances made apparent in this Reply.

I have styled the Immoralities charged upon me false and feigned: for the only thing which sticks to me, of which in my Conscience I am convinced, is, That I have contradicted Him; this Contradiction being an heinous Crime, may an Adversary be judge, who cannot endure to be contradicted by any Man, especially his inferiour, all contradiction being a kind of correction, and all correction being more or less grievous to him, that forsakes the way *i. e.* the way of truth, says the wise Man, *Prov.* 15. 10. But that the inferiority of my condition (suggested by the Doctor) may not prove any remorse or hinderance to the reception and progress of the truth opposed by him, and defended in my Discourse, it may not be amiss to inform the Reader of what the Doctor is not ignorant, *viz.* That there are two persons of a superiour condition (eminent Authors) who in their late Books (come forth since my Discourse) have seconded my sense, and abundantly confirmed all that I have said therein concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to us, and our sins to him. These Authors are the very learned and most laborious Mr. *Richard Baxter*, in his Book concerning the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to Believers; the other is Sir *Charles Wolfely* Knight and Baronet, and a person of rare accomplishments; there remains only one thing, which because it is of comfortable hearing, I have reserved to the last. The Good news is, that notwithstanding all the scuffle which hath been betwixt
the

the Combatants (Doctor Owen and my self) touching the Imputation of Christs Righteousness to Believers, they have (like School-boys) fought themselves Friends, I mean, they are at last perfectly agreed in the said point of difference, for he declares his full assent and consent with Bellarmine in his exposition of the phrase (*The Lord our Righteousness*, Jer. 23. 6.) and says, p. 427. *ihat Bellarmines sense of the words contains the whole of the Cause He (we, says he, meaning himself and the Brethren on his side) plead for.* Now Bellarmines sense he relates in the words following, p. 427, 428. here transcribed, and by him translated.

Christ may be called our Righteousness, because he is the efficient cause of our Righteousness. Again, Christ is said to be our Righteousness, because he hath made satisfaction for us to the Father, and doth so give and communicate that satisfaction unto us, when he justifies us, that it may be said to be our satisfaction and righteousness. And in this sense it would not be absurd, if any one should say, That the righteousness of Christ and his merits are imputed to us, as if we our selves had satisfied God. De Justif. lib. 12. cap. 10.

This sense of Bellarmine the Doctor doth declare his subscription unto once and again, he saying (p. 500.) *It grants the whole of what we plead for.*

Now if he with his Brethren do plead for no more, what need any further pleading on either side? for this is in effect the whole of that, which I have all along professedly and explicitly pleaded for, viz. That Christs Righteousness is called our Righteousness (not indeed because it is ours, or imputed to us in its formal and essential nature, Bellarmine also disclaiming the Imputation of it in this sense, but) because it is the efficient meritorious cause of our Righteousness, in which sense (*sensu causali* though not *formali*) I have acknowledged it more than once in my Discourse to be our Righteousness; to which I add, saying, In this sense Christ is said, as by the Prophet *Jeremiah* to be our righteousness, so by the Apostle *St. Paul* to be
our

our Life, *Col. 3. 4.* because he is the meritoriously procuring cause of our Righteousness, and Life, *viz.* by his satisfaction and merits: And in what sense his satisfaction and merits may be said to be Ours, I have expressly declared in my Discourse, *p. 98. Chap. 19. viz.* Because Christ having thereby abundantly satisfied the Father, God doth, when he justifieth us, communicate them unto us (*i. e.*) in their saving fruits and effects: For to construe *Bellarmines* words otherwise than thus (In their effects) is to impose a sense, or construction upon the Cardinals words contrary to his professed intent and true meaning. And I have said in my Discourse, *Chap. 2. and 3.* even as plainly as doth *Bellarmino* in his words forecited, *viz.* That it is not untruly or absurdly said, that Christs Righteousness is imputed to us: For although I never thought my self obliged to use the expression, and have always therefore in my Praying and Preaching abstained from it (the Phrase not being Scriptural) yet I never had any such indignation against it as some learned Authors (*Dr. Gil and Dr. Thorne-dike*) have in their late Writings manifested; Yea I was so farr from blaming any of my Brethren simply for using this phrase (Christs Righteousness is imputed to us) that I have in an Orthodox sense (which the Doctor himself tells us is the sense of *Bellarmino*) vindicated the use of it, and withall I have asserted in my Discourse (*p. 215.*) That although Christs Righteousness is not immediately and in it self imputed to us, nevertheless its being imputed in its saving fruits, and blessed effects, it is imputed to us to As Much Purpose, And Real Benefit, As If He Were Actually, Or Could Possibly Be So Imputed. To say thus is all one in true construction as to say in the words of *Bellarmino* forecited, *viz.* That Christs Righteousness and Merits are imputed to us, as if we our selves had satisfied God. *Bellarmino* doth not say, Christs Righteousness is imputed to us, because, or so far as much as we in and by him did satisfy God, but it is imputed (that is, to as much our real benefit) As if we our selves had satisfied God.

And

And what now will the Reader say upon the hearing of the Doctors declared, yea repeated acknowledgment of his accord with *Bellarmino*, whose sense in this matter appears to be the same, which I and my Brethren plead for?

All that I will say hereupon of the Doctor, shall be only what himself says of *Bellarmino* in the same page (917.) and in reference to the same thing. *Bellarmino* (says the Doctor) *whether unawares, or overpowered by the evidence of truth, grants that sense of the words, which contains the whole of the cause we plead for.*

So say I, Whether unawares, or overpowered by the evidence of truth, the Doctor hath granted and declared himself well satisfied with that sense of the words (Christ is our Righteousness, and Christs Righteousness is imputed to us) which contains the whole of the cause by my self in my Discourse, and by the Brethren in consort with me, pleaded for; I mean, particularly by Sir *Charles Wolfely*, and Mr. *Richard Baxter* in their late Books, together with many other of the most learned Men of old in the Protestant Churches. And what need is there to say more at present than this in short, *Magna est veritas, quæ prevaluit, etiam ac prævalebit?*

The matter being comprehended by *Bellarmino*, and brought to an accord betwixt us (for *qui conveniunt in uno tertio, conveniunt inter se*) I shall conclude in a good hour, and my conclusion shall be with the same Request to the Readers, that the Apostle used in the close of his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 13. 18.

Stanton
Sept. 24.
1677. Pray for the Author of this Defence, for he trusteth he hath Conscience (notwithstanding all the foul imputations of his Adversary Doctor *Owen*) in all things willing to live honestly.

If Any Man Among You Seem To Be Religious, And Bridleth Not His Tongue, But Deceiveth His Own Heart, This Mans Religion Is Vain. Jam. 1. 26.

God Resisteth The Proud: But He Giveth Grace unto the Humble. Jam. 4. 6.

F I N I S.